

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 364

95

EA 010 762

AUTHOR Scherer, Jacqueline
 TITLE School and Community Linkages in Socialization: Avenues of Alienation.
 INSTITUTION National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Hackensack, N.J. NewGate Resource Center.
 SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE Feb 78
 NOTE 50p.; Chapter 34 of "Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I"; For other papers in this volume, see EA 010 729-768 ; Not available in hard copy due to print quality
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; Change Strategies; *Delinquent Behavior; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interaction Process Analysis; Intervention; Models; *Networks; Organization; *School Community Relationship; *School Role; *Socialization; Student Alienation

ABSTRACT

One of 52 theoretical papers on school crime and its relation to poverty, this chapter is an attempt to adopt a social network model to describe linkages between the school and socialization organizations within a community, and, from this view of the social structure, to develop strategies that will promote more arrangements that are better able to meet the needs of youth and of the community at large. It is the contention of this paper that the divisiveness between the various elements of contemporary socialization systems opens up avenues of alienation for young people. The social network model of school-community relationships that this paper presents is a middle-range effort to develop a conceptual framework for understanding the contacts between different socialization organizations within a limited field. A network model offers a practical action approach to the problems of school and community socialization linkages, restoring to concerned persons some measure of control in handling the serious problems of socialization. (Author/MLF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

A paper from
"Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime"

Submitted to
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
February 1978

Submitted by
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
Hackensack, N.J.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY LINKAGES IN SOCIALIZATION:
AVENUES OF ALIENATION*

Jacqueline Scherer

Oakland University

*The author gratefully acknowledges the constructive criticism of my colleagues, Donald Warren and Edward Slawshi.

ED158364

EA 010 762

Introduction

New conceptual models are needed to understand relationships between school and community and how these affect socialization processes. Since the problems of disruptive youth, juvenile delinquency, and school crime are located within the context of both school and community, models of existing arrangements that concentrate on linkages between organizations are necessary. This paper is an attempt to adopt a social network model to describe linkages between the school and socialization organizations within a community, and, from this view of the social structure, to develop strategies which will promote more arrangements better able to meet the needs of youth and of the community at large.

It is the contention of this paper that the divisiveness between the various elements of contemporary socialization systems opens up avenues of alienation for young people. Those juveniles who literally "slip between the cracks" of organizations are more likely to find pathways to crime than are those youth who "fit" into acceptable groups. Such a contention is neither original nor profound, since considerable research exists to document the "unsystemlike" operation of socialization organizations, and there is sufficient evidence to support the contention in the case studies of delinquent careers (Ahlstrom & Havighurst, 1971; Duxbury, 1972;

Schur, 1973; Mech, 1975; Burgess, 1923).

By conceptualizing the school within a network of socialization organizations, it is possible to understand how the school fits into the overall pattern and to sensitize practitioners to the value of linkage developments.

Socialization organizations are defined as those formal groups within a given community or territory which provide patterns of socialization processes. The idea is similar to that used by Lippett in his view of a "socialization community" consisting of the formal educational system; the churches; the leisure-time agencies with recreational, cultural, and character evaluation programs; the social control and protective agencies, such as police and courts; the therapeutic, special correction, and resocialization services, such as social work programs, employment offices, and political groups; parents; like-age and older peers; and mass media (Lippett, 1974). The term "community," however, may be misleading because it suggests that most of these organizations perceive a commonality of purpose or accept shared responsibility for socialization tasks.¹ In reality, their relationships are often characterized more by hostility, competition, and isolation than by common

¹The use of the term "community" is popular in most educational literature. Oliver has identified two strategies for using this concept with schools. The first is to "communitize" the institution, by humanizing the setting; the second is to develop a style in which special interests are integrated into communal or familylike relationships, based upon face-to-face, emotional ties (Oliver, 1976).

purpose. Juveniles participating in several different organizations encounter inconsistency, uncoordinated activities, and communication breakdowns between units, which do not provide systematic monitoring, direction, or control of individual behavior.

The School and Crime

Implied throughout this discussion is a view of delinquency as a socialization problem. Rhodes and Tracy (1974) point out that "Every intervention carries with it a particular view of the situation of the condition that invites intervention" (p.54). Definitions of deviancy, crime, and delinquency are highly complex; each definition presents a different vision of the problem and its causes.²

It has been difficult to find any agreement, particularly among school personnel, about the nature of delinquency-- is it, in fact, only that behavior which is illegal, or is it any disruptive behavior that disturbs school order, or is it any norm-breaking or rule-violating behavior that causes difficulties? Polk (1976) adopted an interesting definition, calling it a "troublesome orientation," by which

²

The general approach to deviancy adopted in this discussion follows the general principles utilized by Scarpetti and McFarlane (1974, p.22) and includes: (1) deviancy is a social phenomenon in which activities vary from social norms, (2) deviancy refers to variant physical and psychological attributes and belief systems as well as to behavior, (3) deviancy is interactionist--it is defined so by an observer, (4) deviancy may be either positive or negative, and (5) deviancy involves sanctions, both positive and negative, which influence the probability of future occurrence.

he means a "willingness to engage in forms of behavior, especially peer behavior, which render the individual vulnerable to punishment and sanction by adults" (p. 25). This concept is useful in thinking about the issues of alienation that concern many educators and social workers.³ Alienated youth often may be delinquent youth; they often may have a "troublesome orientation" that makes them vulnerable to sanctions, but they always represent a serious breakdown in effective socialization. Rhodes and Tracy (1974) note:

It is quite likely that alienation is a mutual process: that it is a true mutual divorce between the individual and society. If this is so, then the appropriate intervention would be a composite of systems intervention and inter-personal intervention. (p. 36)

Feagans (1974) calls such interventions "exchange-centered interventions" because they "center intervention upon the excitor respondent exchange patterns themselves" (p. 399). In other words, the focus is upon the young person and his or her environment and upon the interface between the two. Exchange-centered interventions require

³The term "alienation" is used here because it includes a wider range of behavior than delinquency. For example, it can include boredom, passive/aggressive behaviors that remain undetected for a long period, as well as the discouragement and frustration that retard socialization processes.

a clear understanding of interrelationships between persons and organizations and between separate organizations. Such understanding is not easily come by, because we know little about how the school functions with other socialization organizations.

In contrast, the relationship between the school and individual delinquent careers is clear. Polk's examination of 284 adolescent males shows that adult success is related to school success, which in turn is related to family status. However, school status and social class exert independent effects on delinquency and adult careers.

Wenk (1976) goes further in his summary of school and delinquency:

Schools have been widely criticized for contributing to delinquency, for failing to adequately prepare youth for responsible adult roles, for labeling children negatively, for dealing with problem students by expulsion, or for doing nothing about delinquency and youth crime.
(p. 6)

More grimly, after surveying school efforts to deal with delinquency, Schutner (1975) concludes that schools can do little to solve the problems that produce delinquency in American society. His research showed that school-based efforts to control delinquency received only limited interest and commitment on the part of school staff engaged

in such efforts.

On the other hand, it is impossible for community organizations concerned with socialization failures to ignore the schools. Most agencies spend considerable time helping individual students cope with school failure. Furthermore, community agencies simply do not have the level of resources or legitimacy of the school. Even more discouraging is the fact that the most effective juvenile delinquency programs appear to be those that bypass the law and order agencies. Klein (1973) defines the major types of delinquency service and prevention strategies as diversion ("any process used by the police, prosecution, courts and corrections to divert offenders from the formal system to a lower level in the system"), absorption ("the process by which such institutions as the family, the school, and the church or such agencies as clinics, courts and Big Brothers take on offenders or suspects rather than reporting them or their acts to the police"), and normalization ("treating behavior classified as deviant as if it were not, thereby eliminating the need for legal sanctions or criminal processing"). Each of these strategies has significant consequences for school community linkages, and not one can be effective without some ties between the multiple organizations of socialization.

Theories and Strategies of the Middle Range

The experiences of the 1960s have not been encouraging for those who sought institutional reform, particularly school reform. Efforts to introduce innovation in the schools were unimpressive; federal policies designed to change programs and stimulate new school directions did not fare well. At the same time, programs for more radical and massive social reform have not appeared politically feasible. The mood of the electorate, as well as the inclination of most policy makers, is too conservative for the social regulation or the instigation of fundamental changes in our social institutions. According to Silver (1977):

To find large-scale social and technological causes extending beyond the simplicities of poverty, race, family life, internalized feelings of deprivation and even wickedness-- is to inject a new dimension into the discussion and to bring public policy to the fore....
(p. 18)

In short, we have a discouraging record of reform and change; delinquency and crime have resisted our most serious efforts to develop theoretical understandings, prevention and control programs have failed, and we are becoming increasingly aware of the complexity of the macrosystemic

transformations affecting the issues. To understand school and community relationships in the face of this appears to be a modest step, but Silver (1977) points out that it may have important impact in the long run.

While traditional social scientists have probably paid too much attention to limited inquiry (individual and small group analysis), the new theorists make the opposite mistakes: they bite off more than they can intellectually chew. Middle range questions abound. (p. 18)

The social network model of school/community relationships which this paper presents is a middle-range effort to develop a conceptual framework for understanding the contacts between different socialization organizations within a limited field.⁴ It borrows from community studies, interorganizational analyses, and communications theory, adopting an eclectic approach utilizing the practices of mental health support systems, alternative education programs, and experimental social service programs. Its significance is that it focuses upon linkages between the parts of a socialization system. Its value lies in generating strategies for

⁴"Middle-range theory" is a term adopted by Robert Merton to distinguish sociological work that is less inclusive than the grand theory development in social systems work, but broader than empirical generalizations.

developing more effective linkages which will close the pathways to crime that currently exist.

The most important benefit, however, is that a network model offers a practical action approach to the problems of school and community socialization linkages, restoring to concerned actors some measure of control in handling the serious problems of socialization. Although it lacks the elegance and breadth of a systems model that provides an abstract conceptualization of the relationships between the parts, it does provide a view of everyday interactions. It focuses attention upon the various organizations and actors concerned with the processes of socialization in a given "interorganizational field,"⁵ and suggests some coping strategies for finding more effective linkages between these parts.

Social Network Models

Social networks are pictures of the ways persons or collectives are surrounded within a field. Within a given space one point can be linked with other points, some (but

⁵This term refers to an ecological model of community organization used by Norton Long (1977) in his view of the inter-organizational field in an "ecology of games." By this he meant that each organization functions within its own domain independently of others with informal cooperation and contest in the general style of coordination. His term is "undirected coordination."

not necessarily all) of which are linked to each other. Social relations are visualized as clusters of social networks rather than formally bounded groups. Interaction processes can be measured by examining the frequency, intensity, range, and quality of communications between points; the directions of interaction; and the durability and symmetry of exchanges.

An analysis of a social network may include the following: the density of the network, or the number of contacts and frequency of contacts between two points; the range of contacts, with measures of the degree of overlap or scope; the durability of contacts over time; and the intensity of contacts, or the psychological potency of the exchange made in contacts. From such measures one can make judgments about the strength or weakness of different parts of the network, estimate the efficiency of various channels and linkages between points, and make tentative statements about the qualitative dimensions of contacts. The type of network analysis used depends upon the kinds of questions which the researcher wishes to answer. The methodology employed can utilize fundamental participant observation, including interviewing, survey instruments, and content analysis of records, or it can use complex computer analyses.

Network models are less judgmental than communal models because they focus upon actual behaviors. Unlike systems models, they do not require the delineation of the systems boundaries--often one of the most difficult tasks in working with systems--because the boundaries are determined naturally by the processes of interaction and can expand or contract. True, a closed network, like a closed system, is easier to study than an open one. But even in a closed network, there can be greater specificity of how interaction occurs within the network, so that one can find indicators of how to change the system without elaborate and confusing analyses of subsystems, or the intellectual difficulties of relating two systems to each other. We do not lose the comprehensiveness of the systems view in a network model: we add the specificity of the microsystems analyses. According to Alba and Kadushin (1976), the revival of network studies "is attributable not only to technological innovations, ultimately traceable to high-speed computers, but also to an increasing recognition of the importance of networks in bridging the conceptual gap between micro and macro structure" (p. 78).

Networks can be constructed to show (1) an individual's pattern of interaction with others, (2) ties between actors in a group, or (3) exchanges with organizations.

The early work on networks was done at the individual level. Elizabeth Bott's classic study of London families in 1954 initiated the use of this analysis with families (Bott, 1972), although John Barnes used it first to describe relationships in a small Norwegian island. Barnes (1954) explained:

Each person is, as it were, in touch with a number of other people, some of whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not.... The image I have is of a net of points some of which are joined by lines. The points of the image are people, or sometimes groups, and the lines indicate which people interact with each other. (p. 43)

Some of the most interesting network analyses have been done by social psychologists, building upon older ideas found in sociometry. Alba and Kadushin (1976), for example, have recently developed an affiliation measure which they believe delineates "interpersonal environments" and allows them to understand the social world of members of a group. Speck and Attneave (1973) have worked out an intervention strategy for family therapy which they call "network intervention," in which they develop "network assemblies of family, friends, neighbors and kinfolk" for a common therapeutic group situation. They refer to this as a reassembling of "tribes," because their goal is to develop interrelationships that are real and useful. They write:

In social network intervention, however, we are experimenting with the idea of setting in motion the forces of healing within the living social fabric of people whose distress has led society, and themselves, to label their behavior pathological. We find that the energies and talents of people can be focused to provide the essential supports, satisfactions and controls for one another....(p.7)

Network analysis in community studies has become an important area of research in the past decade (Scherer, 1972; Effrat, 1973; Craven and Wellman, 1973; Pahl, 1973). Geographic distance is no longer a limiting condition for social interaction, and the concept of community restricted by geography is less valid. From network analyses we begin to understand the processes of urbanization in Africa (Mitchell, 1969) and in Toronto (Drass and Shulma, 1974) as these impact on ordinary lives. Some of the most interesting work has been done by D. Warren (1975, 1976, 1977) in his examination of the neighborhood. He adopts the term "proximity-anchored helping networks" to refer to those social ties based upon a population which interacts, "at least initially, on the basis of a common behavior setting and regarding a specific problem." The value of his approach to networks is that it explains the kinds of relationships which do, in fact, exist in the lives of ordinary people, and suggests strategies by which these natural support systems can

be recognized and utilized.

There have been several attempts to utilize network analyses to understand organizational linkages (Laumann, 1966; Litwak & Meyer, 1967). The field of interorganizational analysis has become an important area for investigation from a great many perspectives, because of the experiences with community action programs in the 1960s and because of the prevalence of the systems perspective in understanding social organizations (D. Warren, 1975; Litwak & Rothman, 1970; Litwak & Eylon, 1962; March & Olson, 1976). We now understand how rational decisions made within an organization may produce irrational systemic effects. Most participants in organizations remain unaware of how their behavior, either as individuals or in directing organizational activities, interrelates with the activities of others. Although abstract models show us these connections, decision makers seldom internalize these understandings in practice. Lip service is paid to liaison programs, or coordination efforts are made, but the rewards for undertaking a concerted approach to working with key linkage organizations have appeared to be minimal and the losses real. As a result, new programs have been started, ostensibly to serve as liaison or facilitators between the school and other community organizations,

but these almost inevitably evolve into independent agents, accountable to no one, and operating separately. Conferences, seminars, and programs which are designed to coordinate community resources for youth are held, but significant changes seldom take place. The literature on programs dealing with youthful offenders or juvenile delinquency resembles essays in social criticism rather than impartial accounts of programs because the discrepancies between organizational goals and actual behavior are so widespread.

The reality of interorganizational contacts is that units basically operate independently, in spite of rhetoric to the contrary or elaborate administrative arrangements to ensure smooth functioning between parts. Organizational activities are unevenly coordinated with other organizations, or enjoy "undirected cooperation." A model which allows for the examination of conflict and consensus, of strength and weakness between parts, and of the unevenness in contact is useful. Social network models are able to accomplish these ends.

The Social Network of the School

It is possible to construct a "typical" school network within the socialization network of most communities, based upon descriptions of school/community relations in the

literature and current research accounts. The following description of such a network is presented to illustrate how a model can pinpoint linkages, rather than to give specifics of any given school. It is clear that there will be particular circumstances which affect one school and not another, that each network will have different characteristics, and that a careful and systematic analysis based upon empirical data is essential to apply the model in any specific case.

The domain of the school includes all formal instructional services for youth between ages 6 and 16, or from kindergarten to 12th grade. The term "domain" is used in this discussion to mean the organization's locus in a field, and includes its goals, resources, and activities (Warren, Rose, & Bergunder, 1974)⁶ and includes important ideological dimensions of all social services, including education. The exchange of intangibles in services places great importance upon beliefs justifying expertise, costs, and institutional authority, and is therefore of consequence in understanding the school's domain.

⁶Another area of research which relates to the network model presented here is that of the relationships between organizations and clients. There is a growing volume of literature on this topic which explores the economic, social, and psychological factors involved in participation in particular organizational contexts. The similarities and differences in the structure and the quality of this participation would be key factors to supplement an analysis of organizational networks.

Since compulsory school attendance laws legitimize the school's domain, the school is highly visible within any community. Strong legitimization and a high profile combine to make the school the most powerful formal institution of socialization in the community, second in influence only to the family. Formal ties between the school and all youth guarantee a continuous school clientele.⁷ In contrast, the organizations of control, recreation, or therapy have highly restricted domains, fewer community resources, and, often, low visibility. These socialization organizations (except those dealing with convicted offenders) must rely upon voluntary cooperation from participants, and have few sanctions to utilize in demanding such cooperation. As a result, these organizations concentrate upon strengthening informal ties.

The nature of contacts differs considerably within the network. Schools dominate contacts occurring with other socialization groups, school staff initiate most of those that occur and limit these, as much as possible, to formal

⁷The view of the community as an interorganizational field has been developed in recent years both in community theories and in organizational research.

situations located in the schoolbuilding. For example, parent involvement is contained within the Parent-Teacher Organizations or occasional school visits, usually clearly identified as formal by such devices as requiring parents to obtain "visitor" passes. The volume of organizational contacts between youth groups and schools tends to be low (Warren et al., 1974), although the number of contacts between the youth population and the school is enormous. Since other socialization organizations deal with only a fraction of the total youth population and on a more informal basis, they are less able to regulate the format or volume of contacts and are vulnerable to client withdrawal.

The types of contacts initiated by schools reflects the powerful position of schools. On the one hand, the school can claim that its domain is narrowly restricted to "academic" matters; on the other hand, it can claim that the school "serves the whole child." Using such an ideology as an umbrella, the school can add or subtract from its domain with more ease than other socialization organizations, particularly those dealing with disruptive youth. In a similar fashion, the definition of concern may become very narrow for those young people who are experiencing socialization problems and disturb the school, whereas it can be expanded to accommodate the development of the more acceptable young

people who pursue athletics or school-sponsored activities. ---

It is important to note that, in spite of the value of strong linkages to the school to other socialization organizations, it is the school which can determine the extent and nature of such connections.

Within each organization in the socialization network there are a variety of liaison specialists, such as school social workers, guidance counselors, police counselors, or community referral workers. These actors provide formal ties between the individual and one or more of the social institutions. There are, in addition, significant informal linkages at the top of the organization (community leaders and school administrators, for example, have occasions to meet each other, or have ties to mutual third parties, such as political leaders), and at the bottom--the client population (youth), school staff such as lunchroom workers and custodians, and others who have firm ties through family and locality attachment to other communal organizations. The large group at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy--students--have many formal and informal linkages to other socialization organizations, such as recreation or church groups. These may provide powerful affiliations for the individual student, but as organization centers they remain less influential because of the strength of the school's functional domain.

Among students with high socioeconomic status, networks are more likely to be "dense." By this we mean that there are many interconnections with socialization organizations. High SES students may also participate actively in recreational activities, church groups, and other voluntary associations. It is reasonable to assume that parents of middle or upper socioeconomic status are more likely to feel comfortable with formal school linkages, such as meetings and newsletters. The school liaison staff has the most contacts with low-SES students and parents, who utilize formal linkages least, relying more heavily on nonorganizational ties to neighborhood groups, kin, or gangs.

The social network of the school may be analyzed as follows:

Domain: Formal, legitimate socialization agency for all youth under 16.

Formal Linkages: Many formal linkages are "on the books" of schools. For example, Parent-Teacher Associations, parent/staff conferences, school events, such as concerts, plays, planned classroom visits, open Board of Education meetings.

Formal Linkage Roles: Liaison specialists include school social workers, guidance counselors, nurses, all administrative staff, community aides.

Formal Mechanisms for Linkage: Exchange are promoted by newsletters, reports, report cards, official records, achievement tests.

Informal Linkages: (1) Students, as the most numerous actors in the school system, may participate in different social organizations daily: home; school; and others. (2) Staff. Although teachers often live in different communities than those in which they teach, other school employees, such as maintenance workers, lunchroom staff and teacher aides, cross between school and other communal intersection points. (3) Parents, although the degree of linkage varies considerably with the SES of the family, the age and number of children in the school, and the school's efforts to encourage parent participation.

Informal Mechanisms for Linkage: Use of school facilities for community functions, transporting small children, travel for older children to and from school, use of playgrounds before and after school.

Characteristics of School Social Networks: (1) Frequency of contacts - high volume, daily for approximately 180 days per year. (2) Formal ties between staff, students, parents. (3) Informal ties between students and peers, sometimes students and school

employees. (4) Infrequent ties to other socialization organizations--when these occur, the school controls the exchange. (5) Externally durable ties with clients from age five on within a catchment area; but internally, contacts are of limited duration in any given class context. The older the child, the less durability of formal school ties. (6) Intensity--More intense with high-SES students because the school domain range is extended to include voluntary activities; less intense with low-SES students since the range is limited. (7) Limited outreach; efforts to increase linkages, since legal status ensures that youth attend school.

Even a cursory description of school social networks reveals the strength of the school position in terms of formal contact frequency, the isolation of the school from other socialization organizations and agencies, and the relatively short channel between school and family. Although the school network analysis illustrates the isolated position of the school by examining individual networks, it is possible to identify key informal linkages which exist between particular actors in the school who participate in a variety of other socialization organizations. We say of these actors that they

"know their way round" or that they know key people to contact within an organization. Identifying these influential ties becomes an important activity for efficient communication between organizational groupings.

Network analyses of school contacts can also provide qualitative information. There is a severe incongruency and a sharp contrast between the contacts and ties existing between the school and other organizations and those existing between the school and actors in the community, in terms of realities and desirability. From the point of view of socialization theories, our understanding of effective socialization practices (from psychology and sociology) suggests that affective ties—those characterized by personal, supportive, responsible, and sustained contact—are essential for human development and behavior change. Structures which provide mutual reinforcement to systems parts, as well as ties between socialization agents that are flexible enough to withstand rapid social change, are important if the socialized person is to gain adaptive skills. But the linkages which are found between the school and other organizations or actors are just the opposite: they are bureaucratic rather than personal, formal instead of informal, more regulative than supportive, rigid instead of responsive, more intermittent than sustained, and characterized by specialized and independent

activities rather than by cooperative and mutually reinforcing work. A qualitative network analysis could provide a given school with an important tool for evaluation of school climate, as well as for assessment of affective variables in socialization.

Another value of a network model is that it raises important questions for research: What are the opportunities for personnel in a given school to link with families? Where are there other natural informal linkages between school and community socialization organizations? How can the frequency of student contacts with the school be utilized to redesign the network? Is there a difference between the voluntary ties of actors with other community organizations and the involuntary nature of school ties? Specifically, in terms of youth with a troublesome orientation, how can the distance between school and socialization organizations of control be reduced?

Strategies for Improving School/Community Linkages

The view of the school in a socialization network suggests some strategies for improving the socialization process by concentrating on linkages in the network. The following are some possible directions for improving organizational ties:

1. Increase the Number of Ties

An obvious strategy to improve linkages is to increase the number of school and community ties. School critics have argued for such a change, demanding that school walls be torn down. Some want a total destruction of "hard" walls making society "deschooled" (Illich, 1971); others want simply to reduce the isolation of the schools and soften the walls (Oliver, 1976; Friedenberg, 1971). Both, however, decry the existing artificial school/community barriers. Specific ways to increase ties are:

a) Utilize school space for community socialization organizations. For example, locate youth assistance offices or the city recreation department offices in schoolbuildings, provide space for personnel from voluntary socialization organizations, to assist youth. This is done regularly for social workers and, in many large cities, police counselors. The idea can be expanded to a variety of socializing agents and organizations.

b) House crisis centers within school walls. The idea of school crisis has as much validity as the recognition of other crises, and some success has been reported with peer-counseling centers operating within regular school programs. Intervention centers which provide coordinated services to youth can be developed (Powell, 1975).

c) Develop formal and regular linkages between the school and other community organizations. It might be useful to view this as a process, starting with informal cooperation and moving into regular formal agreements. Weinstein and Morover (1977) have developed a typology of the four patterns of organizational relationships found in health and welfare organizations which could be applicable to the socialization network. The categories are as follows:

1. Informal cooperation: client referrals, information exchanges, professional consultations, and service planning.

2. Formal cooperation: written agreements that provide for personnel exchanges, material exchanges, patient transfers, and counseling services.

3. Formal purchase agreements: one organization agreeing to purchase services from another, through a contract of specified duration, usually listing the hours of service and a certain percentage of an employee's time, the goal being to avoid duplication of services or staffs when the volume of demand for such services is low.

4. Coordinated services: two or more organizations working together in joint programs, shared facilities, or pooled resources to provide a package of service.

They noted that "public central, public local and private endowed organizations have high boundary control because of their stable channels of funding" (Weinstein & Morover, 1977, p. 98). Schools have been able to remain isolated for this reason, entering into organizational relationships only when forced to do so by community pressures or state law.

d) Informal interorganizational ties at the middle level of the organizations can be encouraged. Teachers and agency staff can meet in community groups. The encouragement of management participation in such community groups as the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis, Rotary, United Fund, and Welfare Planning groups is well established in both industry and commercial organizations, but school representation has generally been restricted to high-level administrators. Teachers could be relieved of classroom responsibilities on occasion to attend such meetings, and school representatives can be encouraged to participate in social policy boards as a regular part of their jobs. Such involvement can become as much of a criterion for the professional development of elementary and secondary school teachers as it has become for academic staff in universities. In a similar fashion, agency representatives can become regular participants in school activities, having a voice in curriculum changes and other school concerns.

2. Use Different Channels for Contact

Examination of the channels existing between the school and other community groups reveals that the most numerous and the shortest channels between the school and families are the students themselves. The underutilization of these effective channels is wasteful. Using students as socialization linkages provides practical and effective approaches to student involvement in the socialization process throughout the community, and operates on both formal and informal levels. Student involvement will also facilitate the first strategy, increasing the number of linkages or ties.

Experts in the field have stated the importance of involving students more actively in schools and community organizations. They cite the importance of developing autonomy and the skills of group work, and the value of involvement in meaningful activities. The National Commission on Resources for Youth (1975) has encouraged participatory programs for young people in both schools and community programs. Youth participation is defined as "involving youth in responsible, challenging action that meets genuine needs, with opportunity for planning, and/or decision making affecting others, in an activity whose impact or consequences extends to others-- i.e. outside or beyond the youth participants themselves." Other ideas are The Integrated Community Education System

(Wenk, 1976), which involves students as partners in research within the local community; The Open Partnership (Ryan, 1976), which leads to shared decision making by all affected or concerned in the common enterprise of education; and a growing number of work/study vocational education programs that include student internships outside the class. The goal of most of these efforts is to engage students as active partners in the socialization process, rather than treating them as submissive and passive role players. Programs, curricular and extracurricular activities, and a variety of experiences in different socialization contexts can be encouraged to achieve these ends.

The Panel on Youth (Coleman et al., 1974) stressed the importance of asking young people to take on more responsibilities, and "to interact with people across a broader range of ages and circumstances, and to expand their work-role experiences." The panel reached the conclusion that the "best way to meet such needs was to decrease the time that young people spend in formal educational settings" (Adams, 1976, p. 313). They also suggested that the federal government provide funds for "host" organizations in the community.

Another underutilized channel is that of teachers, who could be encouraged to participate in other community groups as already suggested and involved in learning experiences

beyond the traditional classroom boundaries.

3. Formal Recognition of Shared Accountability in the Socialization Network

Most school staff do not view themselves as providing social services, and because of the nature of school financing they have not had to. Schools are only marginally discussed in the recent literature on interorganizational relationships in the social services. Most citizens do not see the problems of welfare financing as related directly to the issues of educational funding, and the debates over accountability to date have not linked academic services directly with other specialized social services. As a consequence of this separation between school and social services, the interpretations of the schools' domain have been relatively unchallenged. It is unlikely that schools will voluntarily redefine existing domain assumptions, although it may be possible to encourage voluntary cooperation between schools and community organizations.

Litwak and Rothman (1970) argue that when organizations are linked around facilitative independence—by which they mean that each unit remains independent and has an interest in cooperation to facilitate its own operations—communication techniques are effective procedures for coordination. For example, schools usually work well with youth assistance

agencies on formal programs of substance-abuse prevention. On the other hand, they suggest that, where organizations are involved in competitive interdependence, the most effective procedures may involve legal action. For example, schools probably would have to be forced by law to assume responsibility for supervising young offenders on probation.

The failure of officials to recognize the shared domain in youthful socialization processes has made it impossible to design good follow-up programs. The lack of regular follow-up by professionals is particularly detrimental to young people who have experienced difficulties in many socialization organizations (e.g., offenders, disabled learners, disruptive youth, or medically handicapped juveniles).⁸ Schools have effectively withstood pressure to assume more responsibility for individual students in nonacademic areas, and many of them are pushed out by administrative rules for expulsion or suspension.

Two essential requirements for resocialization efforts requiring strong network linkages are support and feedback. The importance of support systems has been recognized by mental health professionals, who have developed a variety

⁸For example, Rothman and Walker (1976) discovered that 75 percent of all psychiatric professionals never follow up a client once he or she returns to school.

of programs. These include peer support through organized self-help groups, professional counseling for immediate consultation, reference-group support to encourage change, and recognizing, locating, and assisting valuable informal unorganized support systems (Warren, 1975). These are usually located in neighborhood groups or among family and close friends. Feedback is a key element in helping an actor, group, or organization understand whether actions are leading to desirable or predictable consequences. Vickers (1971) has used the term "appreciative system" to apply to all links in the network that can support the actor or group trying to survive in new circumstances. The significant characteristic of this appreciative system is that it provides efficient communication--both in volume and level of understandability--to translate events for accurate and timely feedback. According to Caplan (1972), support systems can buffer the individual against defective feedback by storing feedback clues to help the person and by acting as a refuge or sanctuary from stressful events.

Both feedback and support require strong ties between the school and other socialization organizations. They also require systematic coordination and shared acceptance of responsibilities. A few promising strategies have been utilized in this area. For example, some programs adopt a

"team" approach similar to that used in hospitals for handling difficult medical cases. A group of concerned professionals works together to assist a youth with a "troublesome orientation." Teachers, school principals, school social workers, parents, ministers, recreation leaders, Youth Assistance workers, and counselors make up a team to coordinate efforts. In addition, others in the community can be put into an individual support team--neighbors, peers, relatives, employers, and others within the student's social network--to provide both feedback and support. This is the basis of Volunteers In Probation, Big Sister, and Big Brother groups now operating and can be extended to include school personnel. The goal is to increase the "social capital" of these youngsters, so that they have many relationships which can be utilized. In the future, social workers may develop individual network analyses similar to medical histories taken by doctors. These representations of the person's connections with others can be utilized to design support teams. Speck and Attneave (1973) have already developed techniques for teaching network intervention to therapists. These could be redesigned for school and community staff on a less intensive level. The important point, however, is that all members of the socialization network can be held accountable for efforts in follow-up and follow-through for problem-oriented young people.

4. Extending Network Range

Increasing the number of ties and the overlap between organizations will make socialization networks more dense, but another strategy is to extend the range of these networks. Schools have remained aloof from important socialization activities that occur outside their immediate domain. The most blatant example of this has been television, which clearly has a potent role in the development of intellectual, emotional, and character aspects of young people. Until recently, however, school administrators and teachers have been silent about the quality or quantity of television viewing. Parent/Teacher groups are becoming increasingly troubled about this area of socialization, but the reluctance of the official school institution to participate in supervising or participating in the development of media policies remains.

Another area in which the schools have been largely inactive is that of recreational activities. The problem of transportation is often related to this, since many schools are required to provide transportation for students engaging in recreational events. In other districts students must rely on usually inadequate and expensive buses and trains to get to and from school activities. Yet one seldom finds Boards of Education requesting funds for improved public transportation so that activity programs can be developed, or, for that

matter, recognizing the ties between transportation and socialization opportunities. Also, school staff seldom support recreational activities other than those officially sanctioned by the school.

Strategies which require school staff to participate in linkages with those groups involved in all socialization organizations, within the community and beyond its borders, may become significant factors in creating more awareness of these extensive socialization factors. Such strategies include school staff joining governing boards of these groups, community seminars on youth, planning commissions regulating and designing policies that coordinate activities, and official recognition of mutual responsibilities in socialization processes.

5. Developing More Liaison Staff

Another strategy for increasing school/community linkages involves the creation of more liaison staff, and the design of more creative roles for such formal personnel. A growing interest in youth advocacy represents one such effort. Youth advocates can be effective spokespeople for the interests of particular young persons. An advocate can cross between many socialization organizations, refusing to accept limiting definitions of his or her activity. More outreach workers,

regardless of what they are called (community aides, attendance staff, social workers) can provide a constant flow of information across channels.

One danger in any liaison role is that the actor will not be given sufficient autonomy to operate effectively. When this occurs, he or she becomes the instrument of administrative policies and has no independent base. This has happened to school guidance counselors who spend most of their time testing, screening, and guiding students into school tracks rather than operating between home and school or linking various areas of the student's life. Social workers, police counselors, and medical staff have managed to retain some autonomy.

There is some value in simply legitimatizing the liaison function within a school, but to be effective such staff must be given sufficiently high status and prestige. Furthermore, practical support must follow liaison efforts in the form of resource commitment to efforts. For this reason, implementing liaison strategies requires high-level policies and attention.

6. Reduce Negative Linkages

It would be misleading to assume that all school/community linkages are positive. For example, there is often unofficial collusion between police and school staffs, which diminishes

student trust in all official organizations. Frequently, business contacts have a negative impact on such important matters as curriculum change and innovation. Many peer-contact groups are dysfunctional for preventing delinquency or are highly effective structures to support delinquency activities. It is important to analyze the network contacts for negative linkages, and to find strategies to reduce the number of such contacts and to increase their distance from the school.

7. Research

For any model to have value, empirical investigations must be developed to support or contradict its validity. Most school staff and community organizational staff have no awareness of the exact nature of their contacts within the socialization network, and tend to overestimate the importance of some contacts and underestimate that of others. It is important that serious efforts be undertaken to record and document contacts on a regular, systematic basis. Some analyses are exceptionally difficult to do but, in the long run, might be worth the effort. In particular, studies of peer networks can be useful in developing support systems and in finding programs that reduce negative contacts. Another critical area for study is the relationship between family network ties and the school, again to provide a basis for

establishing and using natural support systems for reinforcing resocialization programs. The methodology of network research ranges from complex mathematical modeling and highly sophisticated computer techniques to basic and simple systematic observation of what occurs in schools and community organizations. The key factor in all research efforts is not quantity or sophistication so much as it is careful attention to the empirical realities as opposed to the perceptions and interpretations of contact information which many organizations and actors accept as true.⁹

8. Other Sources for Network Analyses

These strategies are presented from the perspective of the school. The literature on juvenile delinquency suggests other strategies that begin with the community organizations concerned with offenders, or from the perspective of social services dealing with youth. For example, Knudten (1975) suggests that delinquency prevention specialists be placed on state and local school board staffs, that delinquency prevention training be introduced in teacher training, that school administrators attend in-service institutes on

⁹Another related area is the work done on rhetoric. This borrows from content analysis, ethnomethodological views, linguistic understandings, cognitive anthropology, and other conceptual models. One way to understand the significance of a domain is through the examinations of such rhetorics and the ideologies which these rhetorics represent.

delinquency prevention, and that there be incentives for the schools to keep delinquents enrolled in the system. Whether one begins with the school or with other community organizations, the goal is to increase the number, depth, and range of contacts among socialization organizations.

Discussion of Social Networks

The network model of socialization organizations suggests that we view critically the linkages that exist between the school and other organizations in the community. The results of poor organizational linkages include a reluctance to admit the problems of youth in schools, blaming others for problems rather than working on the issues, developing artificial boundaries to isolate schools from other socialization organizations, utilizing complex coping strategies to deal with perceived threats to domain definitions, and ineffective coordination of parts. The effect of uncoordinated socialization ties upon young people can be seen in the ways in which they utilize the compartmentalized structures to conceal information and to avoid the consequences of their actions, and by their frustration and alienation when adult attention to their needs is continually denied. It is not too extreme to conclude that the divisions between the socialization organizations developed by society to assist

in the social maturation of youth reveal clearly the shallowness of our commitment to our children.

The school appears as the natural center of any socialization network because of its powerful domain position. This power can be used to prevent changes by keeping innovations within the bounds of existing institutionalized structures, by blunting or deflecting threats by co-opting personnel or organizations or dominating community decision-making processes, and by totally transforming an organization or destroying it (Warren, Rose, & Bergunder, 1974).

A significant proportion of coordinative instances take place not only outside of formal coordinating structures, but in a process of contest rather than cooperation. Failure to recognize them as instances of coordination result from a faulty or inconsistent identification of the term with co-operative activities. (p. 67)

On the other hand, Weinstein and Morover (1977) argue that, since organizational complexity leads to more innovation, liaison strategies will add considerably to school complexity and perhaps foster some of this innovation.

The Value of the Network Model of School/Community Relationships

Politically, the network approach as a model to suggest change strategies in schools and community organizations may

be less threatening to staff than other approaches because it does not require a drastic or immediate redefinition of organizational domains. School staff can perceive liaison as "enlarging" their socialization efforts, whereas staff in community organizations can view such programs as expanding their resource bases. Of course, there will be some resistance to the increased number of liaison actors. Inertia will also inhibit the growth of interorganizational contacts, and some hostility will be inevitable when individual actors are required to enlarge their personal network. However, any change strategy would meet some forms of resistance. The most bitter controversies (already raging) will probably center around resource allocation within the overall field of social services. It is likely that schools will be severely challenged to justify their share of available monies because of legal requirements for equality of opportunity, because of the needs of other population segments, such as the elderly, for more services, and because of growing public frustration with socialization practices that do not prevent crime. The network model may appear attractive because it suggests politically viable responses to these threats.

Psychologically, a network approach restores some measure of control to school staff and suggests strategies by which they can influence surrounding structures and processes. Most

school personnel perceive themselves as besieged by a multitude of factors which they cannot influence but which directly influence the conduct of education. There is an almost total paralysis in the field at the present time because of this overwhelming sense of helplessness. Schools can utilize social network understandings to some degree by increasing desirable contacts, by initiating contacts with new sources of support, and by filling the vacuums which now exist. By locating the most effective channels of communication, both formal and informal, and by assessing the relative strength of organizational links, creative strategies for coordination can be developed. In sum, a network approach provides organizations with a coping strategy for handling interorganizational relationships and for making maximum use of limited resources.

Operationally, social networks provide useful models for understanding individual relationships within an organization and between organizations. This discussion has focused upon interorganizational networks, but the concept is equally useful in understanding groups, particularly families, and individuals, particularly students. Its value lies in conceptualizing realities which already exist so that reasonable goals may be established for change.

Intellectually, the social network model introduces an important new element into the discussion of adaptation in

modern societies. Most of the literature on adaptation deals with psychological analyses of individual coping strengths and weakness. David Mechanic (1974) has pointed out that social factors are of equal importance in adaptation but have been neglected in research. For example, we do not know the ways in which organizational affiliations promote adaptation mechanisms in groups or individuals; nor do we understand how the formal interaction which occurs in organizational contexts reflects functional or dysfunctional adaptive mechanisms. In a rapidly changing world, research into the complexity of adaption is imperative. Networks emphasize connections between points and can logically lead us to the examination of social adaptation processes.

Educationally, the importance of examining social networks and developing strategies of linkages to other socialization organizations is clearly a restatement of Dewey's ideas. In his Pedagogic Creed (1897), Dewey wrote: "Education being a social process, the school is simply the form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing that child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for social ends." But when he wrote community (1929), he stated "Men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in

which they come to possess things in common" (p. 154). The questions of community and communication which Dewey recognized as crucial to education are intimately connected with the questions of alienation and rootlessness that are critical to those socialization processes that affect deviance, delinquency, and crime. Social network models help remind us of the interrelatedness of all "education" or "socialization" efforts, while providing realistic maps of the complexity of these ties in contemporary society. Furthermore, networks focus on channels and pathways and suggest the strategies helping us to connect with each other.

References

- Adams, J. Understanding adolescence: Current developments in adolescent psychology (3rd ed.) Allyn and Bacon, 1976.
- Alba, T., Kadushin, C. The intersection of social circles: A new measure of social proximity in networks. Sociological Methods and Research, 1976, 5.
- Ahlstrom, E., & Havighurst, R. Four hundred losers. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1971.
- Barnes, J. Class and committees in a Norwegian island parish. Human Relations, 1954, 7.
- Bott, E. Family and social network (2nd ed.) London: Tavistock, 1972.
- Burgess, E. On community, family and deviance. American Journal of Sociology, 1923, 657-680.
- Caplan, G. Support systems. Keynote address, Conference of Department of Psychiatry, Rutgers Medical School and New Jersey Mental Health Association, June 8, 1972, Newark, N.J.
- Coleman, J.S., et al. Youth, transition to adulthood. Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Advisory Committee, University of Chicago, 1974.
- Craven, P., & Wellman, B. The network city. Sociological Inquiry, 1973, 43, 3-4.
- Dewey, J. My pedagogic creed. The School Journal, 1897, 54. Reprinted in Teaching in American culture, Gezi, K. & Meyers, J., Eds. New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston, 1968.
- Dewey, J. The public and its problems. New York: Holt Reinhart and Sons, 1929.
- Drass, R., & Shulma, N. Social networks and the relocation of migrants. Paper read at Network Symposium, World Congress of Sociology, August, 1974.
- Duxbury, E. Evaluation of youth service bureaus. California Youth Authority, 1972.

Effrat, M. Approaches to community: Conflicts and complementarities. Sociological Inquiry, 1973, 43, 4.

Feagans, L. Ecological theory as a model for constructing a theory of emotional disturbance. In Rhodes, W., & Tracy, M. (Eds.) A study of child variance, Vol. 2, University of Michigan, 1974.

Friedenberg, E. The modern high school: A profile. In Drabick, L. (Ed.) Education: A sociological approach. Appleton Century Crofts, 1971.

Illich, I. Deschooling society. New York: Harper, 1971.

Klein, M. Issues in police diversion of juvenile offenders: A Guide for discussion. In Juvenile justice management, G. Adams et al. (Eds.). Springfield, Ill.: Charles Wiley, 1973.

Knudten, R. Delinquency programs in schools: A survey. In Delinquency prevention and the schools: Emerging perspectives. Sage Publications, 1975.

Laumann, E. Prestige and association in the urban community. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1966.

Lippett, R. The socialization community. In A study of child variance, Vol. 1: Conceptual Models. University of Michigan, 1974.

Litwak, E., & Eylon, L. Interorganizational analysis: A hypothesis of coordination. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, VI, 395-420.

Litwak, E., & Meyer, E. The school and the family: Linking organizations and extended primary groups. In Lazarfeld, P., Sewell, W., & Wilensky, E., (Eds.) The Uses of Sociology. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Litwak, E., & Rothman, J. Towards the theory and practice of coordination between formal organizations. In Rosengren, W. & Lefton, M. (Eds.) Organizations and clients: Essays in the sociology of service. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill, 1970.

Long, N. The local community as an ecology of games. In New perspectives on the American community, 3rd Ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977.

March, J., & Olson, J. Ambiguity and choice, New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Mech, E. Delinquency prevention: A program review of intervention approaches. Arizona State University, 1975.

Mechanic, D. Some neglected aspects of adaptation. In Politics, medicine and social science, New York: Wiley, 1974.

Mitchell, J.C. (Ed.) Social networks in urban situations. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.

National Commission on Resources for Youth. New York Newsletter, 1975, IV.

Oliver, D. Education and community: A radical critique of innovation schooling. Berkeley: McCutchen, 1976.

Pahl, R.E. Instrumentality and community in the process of urbanization. Sociological Inquiry, 1973, 43, 4.

Polk, K. Schools and the delinquency experience. In Delinquency prevention and the schools: Emerging perspectives. Sage Publications, 1976.

Powell, W.C. Educational intervention as a preventive measure. In Wenk, E. (Ed.) Delinquency prevention and the schools: Emerging perspectives. Sage Publications, 1975.

Rhodes, W., & Tracy, M. A study of child variance: Vol. 1, Conceptual models; Vol. 2, Interventions. University of Michigan, 1974.

Rothman, D., & Walker, G. Continuity of care between the psychiatric hospital and public schools. In Franklin, P., & Franklin, R. (Eds.) Tomorrow's Track: Experiments with learning to change. New Community Press, 1976.

Ryan, C. The open partnership: Equality in running the schools. McGraw Hill, 1976.

Scarpetti, F., & McFarlane, P. Deviance: Action, reaction and interaction. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1974.

Scherer, J. Contemporary community: Sociological illusion or reality? London: Tavistock, 1972.

Schur, E. Radical nonintervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1973.

Schutner, A. Schools and delinquency prevention strategies. In Wenk, E. (Ed.) Delinquency prevention and the schools: Emerging perspectives, Sage Publications, 1975.

Silver, I. Crime and conventional wisdom. Society, 1977, 14.

Speck, R., & Attneave. Family Networks, Random House, Vintage, N.Y., 1973.

Vickers, G. Institutional and personal roles. Human Relations, 1971, XXIV, 433-447.

Warren, D. Black neighborhoods: An assessment of community power. University of Michigan, 1975.

Warren, D. Neighborhood and community contexts in help seeking: Problem coping and mental health. Data Analysis Monograph. Ann Arbor: Program in Community Effectiveness, 1976.

Warren, D. Social bonds in the metropolitan community: A conceptual framework. Paper prepared for Midwest Sociological Meeting, April, 1977.

Warren, R., Rose, S., & Bergunder, A. The structure of urban reform: Community decision organizations in stability and change. D.C. Heath, 1974.

Weinstein, R., & Morover, J. A comparative analysis of health and welfare organizations. Pacific Sociological Review, 1977, 20, 79-103.

Wenk, E. Introduction, and Schools and the community: A model for participatory problem solving. In Delinquency prevention and the schools: Emerging perspectives. Sage Publications, 1976.